REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 12, 2003 claims 85-87 and 100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Jacobsen (U.S. 5,673,131).

As the Examiner is aware, Jacobsen discloses circuits 144 on the cylindrical surface of fiber optic strands 130, 132. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner rejected applicants' arguments that "the substrates of Fig. 9B of Jacobsen are . . . not chips." for two reasons. The first was that the claims did not contain the limitations on the meaning of the word "chip" that are found in the definition of "chip" in The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronic Terms. The IEEE Dictionary defines a chip as "A small unpackaged functional element made by subdividing a wafer of semiconductor material. Sometimes referred to as a 'die.'" The second reason given for the Examiner's rejection, was that Jacobsen's statement that the integrated circuit components on the fiber optic cylinders could be transistors, diodes, semiconductors, etc. constituted a disclosure of non-planar semiconductor chips that are designed to be cylindrical in shape.

In response to this rejection, the applicants have deleted claim 85 and have amended claims 86 and 100 to better distinguish applicants' invention from Jacobsen following the suggestions made by the Examiner. In particular, claim 86 has been amended to specify that the first and second semiconductor chips are both planar, that the first subset of electronic devices is co-planar, and that the second subset of electronic devices is co-planar. Claim 100 has been revised to specify a method of capacitively coupling signals between first and second planar chips, each chip having a plurality of planar half-capacitors.

In specifying in claims 86 and 100 that the chips are planar, applicants distinguish over Jacobsen which discloses devices built on cylindrical fiber optic strands. Further, in specifying in claim 86 that the first set of electronic devices is coplanar and that the second set of electronic devices is coplanar, applicants further distinguish over Jacobsen which discloses non-planar devices on the cylindrical surface of the fiber optic strand. Likewise, in specifying in claim 100 that the half-capacitors are planar, applicants distinguish over Jacobsen.

For these reasons claims 86 and 100 clearly define over Jacobsen which does not disclose or suggest the use of planar structures. Dependent claim 87 is patentable for the same reason claim 86 is patentable.

Entry of this amendment at this time is believed appropriate because this amendment cancels one of the claims (claim 85) and amends the other claims along the lines suggested by the Examiner in the Office action of March 12, 2003.

In view of the foregoing, applicants believe that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass the subject application to issue. If for any reason the Examiner believes any of the claims are not in condition for allowance, he is encouraged to phone the undersigned at (650) 849-7777 so that any remaining issues may be resolved.

Aside from the fee for the petition for extension of time, no additional fee is believed due for filing this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge such fee to Pennie & Edmonds LLP's Deposit Account No. 16-1150.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2003

24,615
Francis E. Morris (Reg. No.)
PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 849-7777